Just as a fletcher makes straight his arrow, the wise man makes straight his crooked thinking. —*The Dhammapada*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 57 DECEMBER, 1968 NUMBER 2

DAYS OF MEANING

CYCLES bring changes to the external field of experience, and with knowledge of cycles comes that sense of continuity between past, present, and future which gives man his conception of the unity of the world in time and his basis for thinking in terms of cause and effect. Indeed, the world is *known* through the experience of its cycles, while the human sense of purpose and meaning is largely generated, on this plane, by conscious reflection on the relationship of man to the cycles of nature.

It is for this reason that the study of cycles has immeasurable importance. The vast purview of the Theosophical teaching of cycles creates for the student expanded horizons for the idea of the self. The scene or environment of evolution is no longer a theatre where unknown and alien forces play, but a vast matrix of life in which all is inwardly connected, whatever the temporal conflicts to be observed. The doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation are the means of reconciling, first in the mind, then in practice, the disharmonies met in experience, and of abolishing the distances which bring the illusion of separateness. Unity, in the world of manifestation, is discoverable through recognition of the rule of law, and the operation of law is understood through the study of cycles.

The merely human consciousness is subject, even victim, to the vicissitudes of cycles. Conditions which bear the weight of unknown causation come to seem fixed and final, with the result that a dark

depression settles on mankind. The physical cycles of nature may bring a return of seasons of birth, of the new life of Spring, but when memory is lost of past Golden Ages, and when even the idea of regeneration in human life is blurred by theological inversions of the principles of spiritual causation, then the race becomes an "orphan" indeed, left not only at the mercy of impersonal forces, but confined by pessimistic theories based upon brief interludes of history. Then self-induced and self-devised effort must make its way against clouds of despair, without the encouragements that the great kinship of life affords. Madame Blavatsky has put this effect of karmic cycles in a few words (in "The Fall of Ideals"):

> In a world of illusion in which the law of evolution operates, nothing could be more natural than that the ideals of MAN—as a unit of total, or mankind—should be forever shifting. A part of Nature around him . . . is incessantly transformed, while the harmonious body remains as a whole ever the same, . . . man is continually changing, physically, intellectually, morally, spiritually. At one time he is at the topmost point of the circle of development; at another, at the lowest. And, as he thus alternately rises and sinks, and his moral nature responsively expands or contracts, so will his moral code at one time embody the noblest altruistic and aspirational ideals, while at the other, the ruling conscience will be but the reflection of selfishness, brutality and faithlessness. But this, however, is so only on the external, illusionary plane. . . .
>
> In almost every historical age . . . a wide interval, almost a chasm [lies] between practical and ideal perfection. Yet, as from time to time certain great characters appeared on earth who taught mankind to look beyond the veil of illusion, man learnt that the gulf was not an impassable one; that it is the province of mankind through its higher and more spiritual races to fill the great gap more and more with every coming cycle; for every man, as a unit, has it in his power to add his mite toward filling it. Yes; there are still men, who, notwithstanding the present chaotic condition of the moral world, and the sorry *débris* of the best human ideals, still persist in believing and teaching that the now *ideal* human perfection is no dream. . . .
>
> Meanwhile, the periodic rise and fall of human character on the external planes takes place now, as it did before, and the ordinary average perception of man is too weak to see that both processes occur each time on a higher plane than the preceding.

But despite this weakness, certain dates, marking the ends and beginnings of cycles, retain special significance for human beings. Teachers come in harmony and collaboration with Nature, con-

forming to natural cycles, yet embodying in themselves the promise of more ultimate transformations of which men are themselves capable. These beings leave their mark upon the changing times and diverse eras, constant and unfading beams to those who aspire, but flickering and sometimes disappearing lights to those who are captive of the distractions and deceptions of their times.

Yet fragmentary meanings of the mission of great teachers survive in popular lore, in myth, and in legend. And these sometimes gain secret reinforcement and wonderful elaboration from men whose eagerly searching imaginations give a freshly authentic symmetry to tales of striving after lost truth. The Quest for the Holy Grail is such a recasting of ancient verity, which apparently emerged during the darkness of the Middle Ages; and the symbolism of the Christmas Tree preserved some of the resonances of spiritual knowledge, to stir lost egoic memories in children and other folks. Thus unknown teachers work to keep alive in all the sense of higher longing, and use means outside the rubrics of coarsened belief, in even the worst of times.

In this sense culture is a vast palimpsest of disguised and locally embellished memories of past reminders of human potentiality, many of them now reduced to bits of allegory, anecdotes of magic, or tales of heroism appropriated by foreshortening nationalisms or religious conceit. Ineffectual of themselves, and disfigured by the compromises and complacencies of human nature, these shadowy remains of once wonderful visitations, of once ringing declarations, are nonetheless a soil for the use of other teachers—those who come to restore, to revive, to awaken and renew.

In the new field of awareness generated by the teacher, such clotted memories are disengaged from base material and made to fertilize the new plant of truth. Tired and failing longings are purged of the sediment that held them down, and a light that is for all, because it is *in* all, begins to shine through panes of awareness made freshly transparent by the housekeeping of determined souls.

The new day brought by these cycles is as much a work of Nature as the returning orbit of the Sun. It is a presence which never departed, but was obscured, even though faintly remembered in the tinsel and all too artificial gaiety of a holiday remade, and desperately repeated year after year, by the anxious cults of personal existence.

One wonders at, yet begins to understand, the endless patience of those who teach; who come, each in the measures marked out by the secret rhythms of higher evolution, across centuries, millennia, and whole manvantaras of time. They come by the seasons of the heart, by the openings of history, by the surges of inner evolution, and by the agonies of men bereft of signs that they are not alone in the universe, not creatures dropped on a planetary accident by a concourse of forces opaque to mind and indifferent to meaning. For at certain conjunctions the very cycles which once seemed to conceal so forbiddingly the truth about man and nature become collaborators in human awakening.

Yet it is always according to law, and the good that comes, as though Nature smiles at last in human countenances, is but testimony that no effort is wasted, not the slightest, and that in ages long forgotten, men strove better than they knew. It is now a striving amplified by the vision of a teacher, and given deeper meaning in his light. The vision shows how all life is a cooperative task joining old and young, the wise with the strong, while old failures and pessimisms wash away in the receding tide of cycles over and exhausted.

These Teachers, these patient and forever returning men, are also ourselves—or would be, could we believe it. They are the stuff of our highest being, by choice and timeless alliance. The panoply of the world spreads out before us the high intentions of a common becoming. The mountain peaks are artifacts of ancient resolve, the mold left by consciousness reaching upward and beyond. The seas and rivers, chasms and plains, all have their shape and continuity as inarticulate symbols of endless expressions of the will to be, to grow, and finally to fathom and comprehend. So the world may be a mystery, but it is also a manuscript, a writing of nature's scribes and a text of many languages of the soul—languages for which cycles are both grammar and key.

THE MEANING OF REINCARNATION

SHAKESPEARE was right in saying that life is a play, for the great life of the soul is a drama, and each new life and rebirth another act in which we assume another part and put on a new dress, but all through it we are the self-same being.

The doctrine of reincarnation means that man as a thinker, composed of soul, mind, and spirit, occupies body after body in life after life on the earth, which is the scene of his evolution. In any one life he is known to others as a personality, but in the whole stretch of eternity he is one individual, feeling in himself an identity not dependent on name, form, or recollection. This spiritual man, having always existed, being dominated by the law of cause and effect, showing on this plane varieties of force and character, capacity, and opportunity, his very presence must be explained, while the differences noted have to be accounted for. The doctrine of reincarnation does all this.

In the East the life of man is held to be a pilgrimage, not only from the cradle to the grave, but also through that vast period of time, embracing millions upon millions of years, stretching from the beginning to the end of a Manvantara, or period of evolution, and as he is held to be a spiritual being, the continuity of his existence is unbroken. Nations and civilizations rise, grow old, decline and disappear, but the being lives on, spectator of all the innumerable changes of environment. Starting from the great All, radiating like a spark from the central fire, he gathers experience in all ages, under all rulers, civilizations and customs, ever engaged in a pilgrimage to the shrine from which he came. He is now the ruler and now the slave; today at the pinnacle of wealth and power; tomorrow at the bottom of the ladder, perhaps in abject misery, but ever the same being.

An impartial study of history, religion and literature will show the existence from ancient times of a great body of philosophical, scientific and ethical doctrines forming the basis and origin of all similar thought in modern systems. It is at once religious and sci-

---

NOTE.—This article is collated from the writings of William Q. Judge.

entific, asserting that religion and science should never be separated. It puts forward sublime religious and ideal teachings, but at the same time shows that all of it can be demonstrated to reason, and that authority other than that has no place, thus preventing the hypocrisy which arises from asserting dogmas on authority which no one can show as resting on reason. This ancient body of doctrine is known as the "Wisdom Religion" and was always taught by adepts or initiates therein who preserve it through all time.

What appears to the Western mind to be a very strange superstition prevails in India about wonderful persons who are said to be of immense age, and who keep themselves secluded in places not accessible to the ordinary traveler. So long has this been current in India that the name applied to these beings is well known in the Sanskrit language: "Mahatma," a compound of two words, *maha,* great and *atma,* soul. The belief in the existence of such persons is not confined to the ignorant, but is shared by the educated of all castes. The lower classes look upon the Mahatmas as a sort of gods, and think most of their wonderful powers and great age. The pundits, or learned class, and educated Hindus in general, have a different view; they say that Mahatmas are men or souls with unlimited knowledge of natural laws and of man's history and development. They claim also that the Mahatmas—or Rishees, as they sometimes call them—have preserved the knowledge of all natural laws for ages, not only by tradition among their disciples, but also by actual records and in libraries existing somewhere in the many underground temples and passages in India. Some believers assert that there are also stores of books and records in secluded parts all over that part of Tibet which is not known to Europeans, access to them being possible only for the Mahatmas and Adepts.

The credence given to such a universal theory grows out of an old Indian doctrine that man is a spiritual being—a soul, in other words—and that this soul takes on different bodies from life to life on earth in order at last to arrive at such perfect knowlege, through repeated experience, as to enable one to assume a body fit to be the dwelling-place of a Mahatma or perfected soul. Then, they say, that particular soul becomes a spiritual helper to mankind. The perfected men are said to know the truth about the genesis of worlds and systems, as well as the development of man upon this and other planets. They may be truly called the bearers of the torch of truth across the ages; they investigate all things and beings; they know

what man is in his innermost nature and what his powers and destiny, his state before birth and the states into which he goes after the death of his body; they have stood by the cradle of nations and seen the vast achievements of the ancients, watched sadly the decay of those who had no power to resist the cyclic law of rise and fall; and while cataclysms seemed to show a universal destruction of art, architecture, religion, and philosophy, they have preserved the records of it all in places secure from the ravages of either men or time.

The initiates, being bound by the law of evolution, must work with humanity as its development permits. Therefore from time to time they give out again and again the same doctrine which from time to time grows obscured in various nations and places. This is the Wisdom Religion, and they are the keepers of it. At times they come to nations as great teachers and "saviours," who only re-promulgate the old truths and system of ethics. This therefore holds that humanity is capable of infinite perfection both in time and quality, the saviours and adepts being held up as examples of that possibility.

Such questions as, "Where have I come from?" and "What shall be my condition after death?" trouble and confuse the minds of all men, ignorant and cultured. Priests and thinkers have, from time to time, formulated theories, more or less absurd, as to those pre-natal and post-mortem states, while the Science of today laughs in derision at the idea of making any inquiry into the matter whatever. Theologians have offered explanations, all of which relate only to what they suppose will happen to us after death, leaving entirely out of view and wholly unanswered the natural question, "What were we before we were born here?" And taking them on their own ground, they are in a most illogical position, because, having once postulated immortality for the soul—the real man—they cannot deny immortality in either direction. If man is immortal, that immortality could never have had a beginning, or else it would have an end.

The Wisdom Religion, on the other hand, remains logical from beginning to end. It declares that man is a spiritual being, and allows of no break in the chain of anything once declared immortal. The Ego of each man is immortal; "always was existent, always will be, and never can be non-existent"; appearing now and again, and re-appearing, clothed in bodies on each occasion different, it only appears to be mortal; it always remains the substratum and support

for the personality acting upon the stage of life. And in those appearances as mortal, the questions mooted above—as to the prenatal and post-mortem states—are of vital interest, because knowledge or ignorance concerning them alters man's thought and action while an actor on the stage, and it is necessary for him to know in order that he may so live as to aid in the grand upward sweep of the evolutionary wave.

The doctrine of reincarnation explains life and nature. It is one aspect of evolution, for, as it is reembodiment in meaning, and as evolution could not go on without reembodiment, it is evolution itself, as applied to the human soul. But it is also a doctrine believed in at the time given to Jesus and taught in the early ages of Christianity, being now as much necessary to that religion as it is to any other to explain texts, to reconcile the justice of God with the rough and merciless aspect of nature and life to most mortals, and to throw a light perceptible by reason on all the problems that vex us in our journey through this world. The vast, and under any other doctrine unjust, difference between the savage and the civilized man as to both capacity, character, and opportunity can be understood only through this doctrine, and coming to our own stratum the difference of the same kind may only thus be explained. It vindicates Nature and God, and removes from religion the blot thrown by men who have postulated creeds which paint the creator as a demon. Each man's life and character are the outcome of his previous lives and thoughts. Each is his own judge, his own executioner, for it is his own hand that forges the weapon which works for his punishment, and each by his own life reaches reward, rises to heights of knowledge and power for the good of all who may be left behind him. Nothing is left to chance, favour, or partiality, but all is under the governance of law.

Man is a thinker, and by his thoughts he makes the causes for woe or bliss; for his thoughts produce his acts. He is the centre for any disturbance of the universal harmony, and to him as the centre the disturbance must return so as to bring about equilibrium, for nature always works towards harmony. Man is always carrying on a series of thoughts, which extend back to the remote past, continually making action and reaction. He is thus responsible for all his thoughts and acts, and in that his complete responsibility is established, his own spirit is the essence of this law and provides forever compensation for every disturbance and adjustment for all effects. This is the

law of Karma or justice, sometimes called the ethical law of causation. It is not foreign to the Christian scriptures, for both Jesus and St. Paul clearly enunciated it. Jesus said we should be judged as we gave judgment and should receive the measure meted to others. St. Paul said: "Brethren, be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." And that sowing and reaping can only be possible under the doctrine of Karma and reincarnation.

Reincarnation being the great law of life and progress, it is interwoven with that of the cycles and karma. These three work together, and in practice it is almost impossible to disentangle reincarnation from cyclic law. In daily experience cycles are seen to recur over and over again. The sun rises in the morning and goes to the center of the sky, descends in the west; the next day he does the same thing, and following him, man rises. He comes to the highest point of his activity, and then goes to sleep. So day follows night and night follows day. Those are cycles, small cycles, but they go to make the greater ones. Man was born; at about seven years of age he began to get discretion to some extent. A little longer and he reaches manhood, then he begins to fail, and at last finishes the great day of his life when the body dies. In looking at nature we also find that there are summer and winter, spring and autumn.

Cycles prevail everywhere, things come back again, events return, history comes back, and so we have the saying: "History repeats itself." The Sages tell us that the affairs of this world and its people are subject to cyclic law. It prevails in every kingdom of nature, in the animal kingdom, the mineral world, the human world; in history, in the sky, on the earth. Not only do cycles pertain to the earth and its inhabitants, but also to the three kingdoms of the universe, the three worlds; that is, that below us, ourselves, and that above.

All things have their day, and all things revolve in cycles; they come and go, and come again, though never twice the same. Even our very thoughts conform to this universal law.

What then is reincarnation but a coming back again to life, just what the ancients taught? In no other way than by this cyclic law of reincarnation can we account for the problems of life.

letters • questions • comment

Why did the Universal Soul ever desire to form from itself seemingly lower forms of spirit and matter?

If by Universal Soul is meant "the One Life, eternal, invisible, yet Omnipresent, without beginning or end, yet periodical in its regular manifestations" (*S.D.* I, 2), then it might be added that in an infinite universe there must be infinite possibilities. The pursuit of these possibilities would lead to endless differentiation through more and more concrete forms, yet marked off by cycles. Experience comes only by means of contrast, and there must always be the experiencer as well as the experience. So there would be progressively deeper involvement in forms, the gaining of experience through contact with them, and the assimilation of the meaning of that experience for the purpose of the soul, which is conscious realization of its inherent identity with all life. This means that incarnation is necessarily "periodical in its regular manifestations."

Related to this in another way is the question of what the beings in manifestation are doing here, or should be doing. What is the purpose of all this activity? How can it make any difference what actions are performed, for instance, if there is no beginning or end to evolution? And what then does progress mean, or how can it be measured? Since human beings represent manasic awareness on this planet, it could be said that their purpose in being here is to gather up the lower forms of life and use them in ways that will increase the capacity of those forms to reflect the Universal Soul. It might also be said that human beings incarnate in order to acquire a natural compassion. *The Voice of the Silence* says: "Compassion is no attribute. It is the Law of Laws—eternal Harmony, Alaya's Self; a shoreless universal essence, the light of everlasting right, and fitness of all things, the law of Love eternal." This, in terms of function would mean a conscious effort to act in, upon, and through the lower forms of life, as that Universal Soul, or as an embodiment of that Law. Such concepts as "fitness," "Harmony," and "right" would thus gain definition in terms of the Universal Soul, not by constricted mundane values.

In what sense can a person control his destiny?

Theosophy teaches that there is That in man which is not subject to change; that in contrast to the mass of ever-changing experiences with which he is bombarded, and to which he is constantly reacting, there is a part of him which is ever the witness or spectator of the scene. On the other hand, men are often moved to action seemingly against their will, and without conscious knowledge, by powerful internal as well as external forces. So if a man seeks to control his destiny, it becomes important to discover what that destiny is. Is it a haphazard composite of everything that happens *to* him, giving birth to all the familiar gradations of pleasure and pain? Is it perhaps a fortunate fruition of canny and far-sighted decisions? Or simply a mysterious precipitation from out of the darkness, over which we can exercise no management? Or, again, if the soul is changeless, has destiny some vital relation to egoic continuity?

If all beings share in a common spiritual bond, the destiny of one is inextricably bound up with the destiny of all. It thus becomes necessary to know to what ends we wish to control our lives: Whether for our own sake, simply to avoid pain and court pleasure; or so that in understanding ourselves we become of more use to others. Conceivably, one might even choose consciously a "destiny" of pain, if this would increase his usefulness.

If the soul is indeed immortal, and is an aspect of That which, as Madame Blavatsky put it, is " 'Supreme' as CAUSE, not supreme as effect," we ourselves are Parabrahm and can always determine afresh at least something of the nature of every act. Perhaps this "something" lies in motive, even if it is only a fleeting yearning to do what is right, the desire to be a force for good, or response to the promptings of conscience. But whatever effectiveness is thus brought to bear, it will be on the plane of causes. Therefore the causes with which a person should concern himself are those which reflect the needs of the soul, and those embodiments are best which express and fulfill those needs. What are the needs of the soul? Since the soul is potentially immortal and omniscient, actions which contribute to awareness of the basic identity of all beings would best serve the purposes of the soul. Actions so animated would have far-reaching effects which, even if perhaps greatly modified by past Karma, would eventually take on the character of the soul's true intent.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHEME

Peter and Paul

THE majority of critics show that Peter never was at Rome at all; the reasons are many and unanswerable. Perhaps we had best begin by pointing to the works of Justin Martyr. This great champion of Christianity, writing in the early part of the second century *in Rome,* where he fixed his abode, eager to get hold of the least proof in favor of the truth for which he suffered, seems *perfectly unconscious of St. Peter's existence!!* Neither does any other writer of any consequence mention him in connection with the Church of Rome, earlier than the days of Irenæus, when the latter set himself to invent a new religion, drawn from the depths of his imagination.

The very apostolic designation *Peter* is from the Mysteries. The Hierophant or supreme pontiff bore the title *peter,* or interpreter. The names Phtah, Peth'r, the residence of Balaam, Patara, and Patras, the names of oracle-cities, *pateres* or *pateras* and, perhaps, Buddha, all come from the same root. Jesus says: "Upon this *petra* I will build my Church, and the gates, or rulers of Hades, shall not prevail against it"; meaning by *petra* the rock-temple, and by metaphor, the Christian Mysteries; the adversaries to which were the old mystery-gods of the underworld, who were worshipped in the rites of Isis, Adonis, Atys, Sabazius, Dionysus, and the Eleusinia. No *apostle* Peter was ever at Rome; but the Pope, seizing the sceptre of the *Pontifex Maximus,* the keys of Janus and Kubelé, and adorning his Christian head with the cap of the *Magna Mater,* copied from that of the tiara of Brahmâtma, the Supreme Pontiff of the Initiates of old India, became the successor of the Pagan high priest, the real Peter-Roma, or *Petroma.*

The Roman Catholic Church has two far mightier enemies than the "heretics" and the "infidels"; and these are—Comparative Mythology and Philology. There never was nor ever will be a truly philosophical mind, whether of Pagan, heathen, Jew, or Christian,

---

Note.—The Christian Scheme," begun in November, 1967, is collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky. It recounts the historical background and early development of Christianity

but has followed the same path of thought. Gautama-Buddha is mirrored in the precepts of Christ; Paul and Philo Judæus are faithful echoes of Plato; and Ammonius Saccas and Plotinus won their immortal fame by combining the teachings of all these grand masters of true philosophy. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," ought to be the motto of all brothers on earth. Not so is it with the interpreters of the Bible. The seed of the Reformation was sown on the day that the second chapter of the Catholic Epistle of James, jostled the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the same New Testament. One who believes in Paul cannot believe in James, Peter, and John. The Paulists, to remain Christians with their apostle, must withstand Peter "to the face;" and if Peter "was to be blamed" and *was wrong*, then he was not infallible. How then can his successor (?) boast of his infallibility? Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every house divided against itself must fall. A plurality of masters has proved as fatal in religions as in politics. What Paul preached was preached by every other mystic philosopher. "Stand *fast therefore in the liberty* wherewith Christ hath made us free, and *be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage!*" exclaims the honest apostle-philosopher; and adds, as if prophetically inspired: "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another."

For such men as Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Apollonius, and even Simon Magus, to be accused of having formed a pact with the Devil, whether the latter personage exist or not, is so absurd as to need but little refutation. If Simon Magus—the most problematical of all in an historical sense—ever existed otherwise than in the overheated fancy of Peter and the other apostles, he was evidently no worse than any of his adversaries. A difference in religious views, however great, is insufficient *per se* to send one person to heaven and the other to hell. Such uncharitable and peremptory doctrine might have been taught in the middle ages; but it is too late now for even the Church to put forward this traditional scarecrow. Research begins to suggest that which, if ever verified, will bring eternal disgrace on the Church of the Apostle Peter, whose very imposition of herself upon that disciple must be regarded as the most unverified and unverifiable of the assumptions of the Catholic clergy.

The erudite author of *Supernatural Religion* assiduously endeavors to prove that by *Simon Magus* we must understand the apostle

Paul, whose Epistles were secretly as well as openly calumniated by Peter, and charged with containing "*dysnoëtic* learning." The Apostle of the Gentiles was brave, outspoken, sincere, and very learned; the Apostle of Circumcision, cowardly, cautious, *insincere,* and very ignorant. That Paul had been, partially, at least, if not completely, initiated into the theurgic mysteries, admits of little doubt. His language, the phraseology so peculiar to the Greek philosophers, certain expressions used but by the initiates, are so many sure ear-marks to that supposition. Our suspicion has been strengthened by an able article in one of the New York periodicals, entitled *Paul and Plato,* in which the author puts forward one remarkable and, for us, very precious observation. In his Epistles to the Corinthians he shows Paul abounding with "expressions suggested by the initiations of Sabazius and Eleusis, and the lectures of the (Greek) philosophers. He (Paul) designates himself an *idiotes*—a person unskilful in the Word, but not in the *gnosis* or philosophical learning. 'We speak wisdom among the perfect or initiated,' he writes; 'not the wisdom of this world, nor of the archons of this world, but divine wisdom in a mystery, secret—which *none of the Archons of this world knew.*' "

What else can the apostle mean by these unequivocal words, but that he himself, as belonging to the *mystæ* (initiated), spoke of things shown and explained only in the Mysteries? The "divine wisdom in a mystery which none of the *archons of this world knew,*" has evidently some direct reference to the *basileus* of the Eleusinian initiation who *did know.* The *basileus* belonged to the staff of the great hierophant, and was an *archon* of Athens; and as such was one of the chief *mystæ,* belonging to the *interior* Mysteries, to which a very select and small number obtained an entrance. The magistrates supervising the Eleusinians were called archons.

Another proof that Paul belonged to the circle of the "Initiates" lies in the following fact. The apostle had his head shorn at Cenchrea (where Lucius, *Apuleius,* was initiated) because "he had a vow." The *nazars*—or set apart—as we see in the Jewish Scriptures, had to cut their hair which they wore long, and which "no razor touched" at any other time, and sacrifice it on the altar of initiation. And the nazars were a class of Chaldean theurgists. We will show further that Jesus belonged to this class.

Paul declares that: "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise *master-builder,* I have laid the foundation."

This expression, master-builder, used only *once* in the whole Bible, and by Paul, may be considered as a whole revelation. In the Mysteries, the third part of the sacred rites was called *Epopteia,* or revelation, reception into the secrets. In substance it means that stage of divine clairvoyance when everything pertaining to this earth disappears, and earthly sight is paralyzed, and the soul is united free and pure with its Spirit, or God. But the real significance of the word is "overseeing," from *optomai—I see myself.* In Sanscrit the word *evâpto* has the same meaning, as well as *to obtain.*[1] The word *epopteia* is a compound one, from *Epi*—upon, and *optomai*—to look, or an overseer, an inspector—also used for a master-builder. The title of master-mason, in Freemasonry, is derived from this, in the sense used in the Mysteries. Therefore, when Paul entitles himself a "master-builder," he is using a word pre-eminently kabalistic, theurgic, and masonic, and one which no other apostle uses. He thus declares himself an *adept,* having the right to *initiate* others.

If we search in this direction, with those sure guides, the Grecian Mysteries and the *Kabala,* before us, it will be easy to find the secret reason why Paul was so persecuted and hated by Peter, John, and James. The author of the Revelation was a Jewish kabalist *pur sang,* with all the hatred inherited by him from his forefathers toward the Mysteries.[2] His jealousy during the life of Jesus extended even to Peter; and it is but after the death of their common master that we see the two apostles—the former of whom wore the Mitre and the Petaloon of the Jewish Rabbis—preach so zealously the rite of circumcision. In the eyes of Peter, Paul, who had humiliated him, and whom he felt so much his superior in "Greek learning" and philosophy, must have naturally appeared as a magician, a man polluted with the *"Gnosis,"* with the "wisdom" of the Greek Mysteries—hence, perhaps, "Simon[3] the Magician."

---

[1] In its most extensive meaning, the Sanscrit word has the same literal sense as the Greek term; both imply "revelation," by no human agent, but through the "receiving of the sacred drink." In India the initiated received the "Soma," sacred drink, which helped to liberate his soul from the body; and in the Eleusinian Mysteries it was the sacred drink offered at the Epopteia. The Grecian Mysteries are wholly derived from the Brahmanical Vedic rites, and the latter from the ante-vedic religious Mysteries—primitive Buddhist philosophy.

[2] It is needless to state that the Gospel according to John was not written by John but by a Platonist or a Gnostic belonging to the Neo-platonic school.

[3] The fact that Peter persecuted the "Apostle to the Gentiles," under that name, does not necessarily imply that there was no Simon Magus individually distinct from Paul. It may have become a generic name of abuse. Theodoret and Chrysostom, the earliest and most prolific commentators on the Gnosticism of those days, seem actually to make of Simon a rival of Paul, and to state that between them passed frequent messages. The

As to Peter, biblical criticism has shown before now that he had probably no more to do with the foundation of the Latin Church at Rome, than to furnish the pretext so readily seized upon by the cunning Irenæus to benefit this Church with the new name of the apostle—*Petra* or *Kiffa,* a name which allowed so readily, by an easy play upon words, to connect it with *Petroma,* the double set of stone tablets used by the hierophant at the initiation, during the final Mystery. In this, perhaps, lies concealed the whole secret of the claims of the Vatican. As Professor Wilder happily suggests: "In the Oriental countries the designation Peter (in Phœnician and Chaldaic, an interpreter) appears to have been the title of this personage (the hierophant). . . . There is in these facts some reminder of the peculiar circumstances of the Mosaic Law . . . and also of the claim of the Pope to be the successor of Peter, the hierophant or interpreter of the Christian religion."[4]

As such, we must concede to him, to some extent, the right to be such an interpreter. The Latin Church has faithfully preserved in symbols, rites, ceremonies, architecture, and even in the very dress of her clergy, the tradition of the Pagan worship—of the public or exoteric ceremonies, we should add; otherwise her dogmas would embody more sense and contain less blasphemy against the majesty of the Supreme and Invisible God.

An inscription found on the coffin of Queen Mentuhept, of the eleventh dynasty (2250 B.C.), now proved to have been transcribed from the seventeenth chapter of the *Book of the Dead* (dating not later than 4500 B.C.), is more than suggestive. This monumental text contains a group of hieroglyphics, which, when interpreted, read thus:

PTR. RF. SU.

Peter- ref- su.

Baron Bunsen shows this sacred formulary mixed up with a whole series of glosses and various interpretations on a monument forty centuries old. "This is identical with saying that the record (the

---

former, as a diligent propagandist of what Paul terms the "antitheses of the Gnosis" (1st Epistle to Timothy), must have been a sore thorn in the side of the apostle. There are sufficient proofs of the actual existence of Simon Magus.

[4] Had we not trustworthy kabalistic tradition to rely upon, we might be, perhaps, forced to question whether the authorship of the Revelation is to be ascribed to the apostle of that name. He seems to be termed John the Theologist.

true interpretation) was at that time no longer intelligible. . . . We beg our readers to understand," he adds, "that a sacred text, a hymn, containing the words of a departed spirit, existed in such a state about 4,000 years ago . . . as to be all but unintelligible to royal scribes."

That it was unintelligible to the unitiated among the latter is as well proved by the confused and contradictory glossaries, as that it was a "mystery"-word, known to the hierophants of the sanctuaries, and, moreover, a word chosen by Jesus, to designate the office assigned by him to one of his apostles. This word, PTR, was partially interpreted, owing to another word similiarly written in another group of hieroglyphics, on a stele, the sign used for it being an opened eye.[5] Bunsen mentions as another explanation of PTR—"to show." "It appears to me," he remarks, "that our PTR is literally the old Aramaic and Hebrew 'Patar,' which occurs in the history of Joseph as the specific word for *interpreting;* whence also *Pitrum* is the term for interpretation of a text, a dream." In a manuscript of the first century, a combination of the Demotic and Greek texts, and most probably one of the few which miraculously escaped the Christian vandalism of the second and third centuries, when all such precious manuscripts were burned as magical, we find occurring in several places a phrase, which, perhaps, may throw some light upon this question. One of the principal heroes of the manuscript, who is constantly referred to as "the Judean Illuminator" or Initiate, is made to communicate but with his *Patar;* the latter being written in Chaldaic characters. Once the latter word is coupled with the name *Shimeon*. Several times, the "Illuminator," who rarely breaks his contemplative solitude, is shown inhabiting a cave, and teaching the multitude of eager scholars standing outside, not orally, but through this *Patar*. The latter receives the words of wisdom by applying his ear to a circular hole in a partition which conceals the teacher from the listeners, and then conveys them, with explanations and glossaries, to the crowd. This, with a slight change, was the method used by Pythagoras, who, as we know, never allowed his neophytes to see him during the years of probation, but instructed them from behind a curtain in his cave.

But, whether the "Illuminator" of the Græco-Demotic manuscript

---

[5] See de Rougé: "Stele," p. 44; PTAR (videus) is interpreted on it "to appear," with a sign of interrogation after it—the usual mark of scientific perplexity. In Bunsen's fifth volume of "Egypt," the interpretation following is "Illuminator," which is more correct.

is identical with Jesus or not, the fact remains, that we find him selecting a "mystery"-appellation for one who is made to appear later by the Catholic Church as the janitor of the Kingdom of Heaven and the interpreter of Christ's will. The word Patar or Peter locates both master and disciple in the circle of initiation, and connects them with the "Secret Doctrine." The great hierophant of the ancient Mysteries never allowed the candidates to see or hear him personally. He was the Deus-ex-Machina, the presiding but invisible Deity, uttering his will and instructions through a second party; and 2,000 years later, we discover that the Dalaï-Lamas of Thibet had been following for centuries the same traditional programme during the most important religious mysteries of lamaism. If Jesus knew the secret meaning of the title bestowed by him on Simon, then he must have been initiated; otherwise he could not have learned it; and if he was an initiate of either the Pythagorean Essenes, the Chaldean Magi, or the Egyptian Priests, then the doctrine taught by him was but a portion of the "Secret Doctrine" taught by the Pagan hierophants to the few selected adepts admitted within the sacred adyta.

We must once more return to that greatest of all the Patristic frauds; the one which has undeniably helped the Roman Catholic Church to its unmerited supremacy, viz.: the barefaced assertion, in the teeth of historical evidence, that Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome. It is but too natural that the Latin clergy should cling to it, for, with the exposure of the fraudulent nature of this pretext, the dogma of apostolic succession must fall to the ground.

There have been many able works of late, in refutation of this preposterous claim. Among others we note Mr. G. Reber's, *The Christ of Paul,* which overthrows it quite ingeniously. The author proves, 1, that there was no church established at Rome, until the reign of Antoninus Pius; 2, that as Eusebius and Irenæus both agree that Linus was the second Bishop of Rome, into whose hands "the blessed apostles" Peter and Paul committed the church after building it, it could not have been at any other time than between A.D. 64 and 68; 3, that this interval of years happens during the reign of Nero, for Eusebius states that Linus held his office twelve years (*Ecclesiastical History,* book iii., c .13), entering upon it A.D. 69, one year after the death of Nero, and dying himself in 81. After that the author maintains, on very solid grounds, that Peter could not be in Rome A.D. 64, for he was then in Babylon; wherefrom he wrote his first Epistle, the date of which is fixed by Dr. Lardner and

other critics at precisely this year. But we believe that his best argument is in proving that it was not in the character of the cowardly Peter to risk himself in such close neighborhood with Nero, who "was feeding the wild beasts of the Amphitheatre with the flesh and bones of Christians" at that time.

Perhaps the Church of Rome was but consistent in choosing as her titular founder the apostle who thrice denied his master at the moment of danger; and the only one, moreover, except Judas, who provoked Christ in such a way as to be addressed as the "Enemy." "Get thee behind me, SATAN!" exclaims Jesus, rebuking the taunting apostle.

There is a tradition in the Greek Church which has never found favor at the Vatican. The former traces its origin to one of the Gnostic leaders—Basilides, perhaps, who lived under Trajan and Adrian, at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century. With regard to this particular tradition, if the Gnostic is Basilides, then he must be accepted as a sufficient authority, having claimed to have been a disciple of the Apostle Matthew, and to have had for master Glaucias, a disciple of St. Peter himself. Were the narrative attributed to him authenticated, the London Committee for the Revision of the Bible would have to add a new verse to Matthew, Mark, and John, who tell the story of Peter's denial of Christ.

This tradition, then, of which we have been speaking, affirms that, when frightened at the accusation of the servant of the high priest, the apostle had thrice denied his master, and the cock had crowed, Jesus, who was then passing through the hall in custody of the soldiers, turned, and, looking at Peter, said: "Verily, I say unto thee, Peter, thou shalt deny me throughout the coming ages, and never stop until thou shalt be old, and shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and carry thee wither thou wouldst not." The latter part of this sentence, say the Greeks, relates to the Church of Rome, and prophesies her constant apostasy from Christ, under the mask of false religion. Later, it was inserted in the twenty-first chapter of John, but the whole of this chapter had been pronounced a forgery, even before it was found that this Gospel was never written by John the Apostle at all.

The anonymous author of *Supernatural Religion,* a work which in two years passed through several editions, and which is alleged to have been written by an eminent theologian, proves conclusively the spuriousness of the four gospels, or at least their complete trans-

formation in the hands of the too-zealous Irenæus and his champions. The fourth gospel is completely upset by this able author; the extraordinary forgeries of the Fathers of the early centuries are plainly demonstrated, and the relative value of the synoptics is discussed with an unprecedented power of logic. The work carries conviction in its every line. From it we quote the following: "We gain infinitely more than we lose in abandoning belief in the reality of Divine Revelation. Whilst we retain, pure and unimpaired, the treasure of Christian morality, we relinquish nothing but the debasing elements added to it by human superstition. We are no longer bound to believe a theology which outrages reason and moral sense. We are freed from base anthropomorphic views of God and His government of the Universe, and from Jewish Mythology we rise to higher conceptions of an infinitely wise and beneficent Being, hidden from our finite minds, it is true, in the impenetrable glory of Divinity, but whose laws of wondrous comprehensiveness and perfection we ever perceive in operation around us. . . . The argument so often employed by theologians, that Divine revelation is necessary for man, and that certain views contained in that revelation are required for our moral consciousness, is purely imaginary, and derived from the revelation which it seeks to maintain. The only thing absolutely necessary for man is TRUTH, and to that, and that alone, must our moral consciousness adapt itself."

We will consider farther in what light was regarded the Divine revelation of the Jewish Bible by the Gnostics, who yet believed in Christ in their own way, a far better and less blasphemous one than the Roman Catholic. The Fathers have forced on the believers in Christ a Bible, the laws prescribed in which he was the first to break; the teachings of which he utterly rejected; and for which crimes he was finally crucified. Of whatever else the Christian world can boast, it can hardly claim logic and consistency as its chief virtues.

The fact alone that Peter remained to the last an "apostle of the circumcision," speaks for itself. *Whosoever else might have built the Church of Rome it was not Peter.* If such were the case, the successors of this apostle would have to submit themselves to circumcision, if it were but for the sake of consistency, and to show that the claims of the popes are not utterly groundless, Dr. Inman asserts that report says that "in our Christian times popes have to be privately perfect," but we do not know whether it is carried to the extent of the Levitical Jewish law. The first fifteen Christian bishops of Jeru-

salem, commencing with James and including Judas, were all circumcised Jews.

In the *Sepher Toldos Jeshu,* a Hebrew manuscript of great antiquity, the version about Peter is different. Simon Peter, it says, was one of their own brethren, though he had somewhat departed from the laws, and the Jewish hatred and persecution of the apostle seems to have existed but in the fecund imagination of the fathers. The author speaks of him with great respect and fairness, calling him "a faithful servant of the living God," who passed his life in austerity and meditation, "living in Babylon at the summit of a tower," composing hymns, and preaching charity. He adds that Peter always recommended to the Christians not to molest the Jews, but as soon as he was dead, behold another preacher went to Rome and pretended that Simon Peter had altered the teachings of his master. He invented a burning hell and threatened every one with it; promised miracles, but worked none.

How much there is in the above of fiction and how much of truth, it is for others to decide; but it certainly bears more the evidence of sincerity and fact on its face, than the fables concocted by the fathers to answer their end.

We may the more readily credit this friendship between Peter and his late co-religionists as we find in *Theodoret* the following assertion: "The Nazarenes are Jews, honoring the ANOINTED (Jesus) as a *just man* and using the *Evangel* according to Peter." Peter was a Nazarene, according to the *Talmud.* He belonged to the sect of the later Nazarenes, which dissented from the followers of John the Baptist, and became a rival sect; and which—as tradition goes—was instituted by Jesus himself.

ILLUSIVE OPPOSITES

Dogmatism is much closer to skepticism than we imagine. . . . For the dogmatics, quite as much as for the skeptics, the essential thing is their *eopche* (suspension of judgment)—with this difference: that the skeptic, when he has had enough of trying to untie the Gordian knot of existence, declares, "We know nothing and can know nothing; it is useless to struggle," while the dogmatic says, "I already know all that is necessary to know; accept what I know and be content."

—LEV SHESTOV

CURIOUS INCIDENTS

> It is not thought that Utopia can be established in a day; but, through the spreading of the idea of Universal Brotherhood, the truth in all things may be discovered.
>
> —Wm Q. Judge

WE are nearing the close of the hundred-year cycle which began on the 17th of November, 1875—an auspicious date in the history of the spiritual progress of mankind. The Theosophical Society, whose avowed object was "to form a nucleus for Universal Brotherhood," was established on that date. Its founders were H. P. Blavatsky, Wm. Q. Judge, and Henry S. Olcott—the latter remaining president of the Society until his death in 1907. H.P.B. and W.Q.J. were engaged with the inner life of the Movement, not to be confused with its temporary, exoteric vehicle. For we know that—

> Wherever thought has struggled to be free, wherever spiritual ideas, as opposed to forms and dogmatism, have been promulgated, there the great Movement is to be discerned. The Theosophical Movement is moral, ethical, spiritual, universal, invisible save in effect, and continuous.

Some strange incidents mark the path of the Theosophical Movement. Writing in *Echoes from the Orient* fifteen years after the formation of the Theosophical Society, Mr. Judge speaks of the existence of Perfected Men, "said to know the truth about the genesis of worlds and systems, as well as the development of man upon this and other planets"; then he introduces the idea of Reincarnation with its twin doctrine of Karma—"which holds that no power, human or divine, can save one from the consequences of acts performed, and that in this life we are experiencing the results due to us for all acts and thoughts which were ours in the preceding incarnation." Then follows the description of a major incident relating to the Society:

> Very soon after it was launched forth, its president, Col. H. S. Olcott, who during our late war was a familiar figure in Wash-

> ington, found a new member in Baron Henry de Palm, who died and obligingly left his body to the Colonel to be cremated. The funeral was held at Masonic Hall, New York, and attracted great attention. It was theosophical in character. Col. Olcott presided, a Spiritualist offered an invocation, and a materialist read a service. All this, of course, drew forth satire from the press, but served the purpose of gaining some attention for the young society. Its history since then has been remarkable, and it is safe to say that no other similar body of this century has drawn to itself so much consideration, stirred up such a thinking among people on mystical subjects, and grown so rapidly among the loudest derision and against the fiercest opposition, within the short space of fifteen years.

Recently an incredibly unlikely incident again brought the name of Theosophy and of H. P. Blavatsky—the two cannot be separated —into the limelight. The alleged slayer of Robert Kennedy was said to have asked for *The Secret Doctrine,* and also "a handbook of revolution" purportedly written by H. P. Blavatsky. As could be expected, a flurry of sensation resulted. It was readily possible, of course, for anyone to find out that no grounds exist for associating the name of H. P. Blavatsky with a book having political implications. In *The Key to Theosophy,* when asked why the Society "takes absolutely no part in any national or party politics," she replied:

> It is international in the highest sense in that its members comprise men and women of all races, creeds, and forms of thought, who work together for one object, the improvement of humanity. . . . Political action must necessarily vary with the circumstances of the time and with the idiosyncrasies of individuals. While from the very nature of their position as Theosophists the members of the T.S. are agreed on the principles of Theosophy, or they would not belong to the society at all, it does not thereby follow that they agree on every other subject. As a society they can only act together in matters which are common to all—that is, Theosophy itself; as individuals, each is left perfectly free to follow out his or her particular line of political thought and action, so long as this does not conflict with Theosophical principles or hurt the Theosophical Society.

This recent incident became the occasion for special publication in an advertisement of a list of *The Works of H. P. Blavatsky,* with instructive commentary, giving wide publicity to the books she wrote.

The Teachers of Theosophy—H.P.B. and W.Q.J.—never put emphasis on the acquisition of any sort of "powers," but on the

need for developing self-reliance and a sense of responsibility. The individual should, naturally, assume responsibility for himself. But who will assume responsibility for the welfare of Theosophy in the world? Perhaps the current phenomenon indicates the unpredictable nature of incidents in the future. If so, another dimension of responsibility is added to the meaning of the closing section of *The Key to Theosophy*: "The future of the Theosophical Movement will depend almost entirely upon the degree of selflessness, earnestness, devotion, and last, but not least, on the amount of knowledge and wisdom possessed by those members, on whom it will fall to carry on the work."

Another part of the work of the Theosophical Movement is to correct misconceptions as to the nature of man and his destiny. One highly pertinent approach is treated by Mr. Judge in an article, "Occultism: What is it?" It begins:

> Not only in the Theosophical Society, but out of it, are tyros in Occultism. They are dabblers in a fine art, a mighty science, an almost impenetrable mystery. The motives that bring them to the study are as various as the number of individuals engaged in it, and as hidden from even themselves as is the centre of the earth from the eye of science. Yet the *motive* is more important than any other factor.
>
> These dilettanti in this science have always been abroad. No age or country has been without them, and they have left after them many books—of no particular value. Those of today are making them now, for the irresistible impulse of vanity drives them to collate the more or less sound hypotheses of their predecessors, which, seasoned with a proper dash of mystery, are put forth to the crowd of those who would fain acquire wisdom at the cost-price of a book. Meanwhile the world of real occultists smiles silently, and goes on with the laborious process of sifting out the living germs from the masses of men. For occultists must be found and fostered and prepared for coming ages when power will be needed and pretension will go for nothing.

The closing paragraph reads:

> It is wiser for theosophists to study the doctrine of brotherhood and its application, to purify their motives and actions, so that after patient work for many lives, if necessary, in the great cause of humanity, they may at last reach that point where all knowledge and all power will be theirs by right.

on the lookout

"Very Intuitional Philosopher"

An article in the May 1968 *Scientific American,* honoring Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, deserves notice. The writer, Frederick C. Kreiling, provides an excellent summary of the seventeenth-century thinker's life, showing that his philosophic bent kept him wary of fallacies which attracted Descartes, and even Newton, and also enabled him to point the way to many of the recent innovations in mathematics and its practical applications. Theosophical students know the extensive use made by Madame Blavatsky of Leibniz' ideas, in elaborating the doctrine of the Monads in *The Secret Doctrine*. Her respect for him, whom she calls, "not an Initiate, nor even a Mystic, only a very intuitional philosopher," is indicated by the following:

> The divisions made by Leibnitz, however incomplete and faulty from the standpoint of Occultism, show a spirit of metaphysical intuition to which no man of science, not Descartes—not even Kant—has ever reached. With him there existed ever an infinite gradation of thought. Only a small portion of the contents of our thoughts, he said, rises into the clearness of apperception, "into the light of perfect consciousness. Many remain in a confused or obscure state, in the state of "perceptions": but they are there; . . . Descartes denied soul to the animal, Leibnitz endowed, as the Occultists do, "the whole creation with mental life, this being, according to him, capable of infinite gradations." (*S.D.* I, 627.)

Admirer of Lull

Oddly enough, Leibniz' enduring dream was of what might be called a universal computer, with which "the truth of any proposition in any field of human inquiry could be determined by simple calculation." The *Scientific American* writer traces his discovery of calculus:

> At first it was the logical and the occult which interested him most; he studied the number diagrams of the 13th-century Spanish mystic Ramon Lull, for example. It was only when he visited Paris and London in the 1670's that he became acquainted with

leading mathematicians, including Huygens, and learned about contemporary advances in algebra and geometry. Soon he discovered the fundamental principle of the calculus: that differentiation, the means of studying limits and rates, is the inverse of integration.

Mathematical Pioneer

Mr. Kreiling says in general:

> . . . his [Leibniz'] vision pointed the way toward modern symbolic logic, as such 20th-century mathematicians and logicians as Bertrand Russell, Kurt Gödel and Alfred Tarski have recognized. Indeed, Norbert Wiener suggested that Leibniz might be considered the patron saint of communication theory and control theory, twin mathematical foundations of much contemporary technology, because his thought centered on "two closely related concepts, that of a universal symbolism and that of a calculus of reasoning. From these are descended the mathematical notation and the symbolic logic of the present day."

Leibniz' criticism of Newton's *Principia,* Mr. Kreiling says, "had a prophetic edge." In a letter to Samuel Clarke, a philosophical friend of Newton's, he said that space and time are not independent, absolute entities, as maintained by Descartes and Newton, but rather systems of relations and order among things.

Relative Time and Space

> "As for my own opinion," he wrote in his third letter to Clarke, "I have said more than once that I hold space to be something purely relative, as time is; that I hold it to be an order of coexistences, as time is an order of successions. For space denotes, in terms of possibility, an order of things which exist at the same time, considered as existing together without inquiring into their manner or existing." Again, in his fifth letter he observed that "it is sufficient to consider these . . . relations and rules of their changes without needing to fancy any absolute reality out of the things whose situation we consider."
>
> As Albert Einstein noted, Leibniz' criticisms were justified. Einstein pointed out, however, that "had they won out at that time, it hardly would have been a boon to physics, for the empirical and theoretical foundations necessary to follow up his idea were not available in the 17th century."

The "space" to which Liebniz refers is obviously not the absolute abstract space of the first fundamental proposition of the Secret Doctrine, but the space which is in effect "created" by the presence of matter—the space which is measurable. Newton seemed almost to confuse the two ideas.

The Monads

Leibniz' philosophical conceptions affected his scientific thinking. Mr. Kreiling says:

> When Leibniz spoke of energy . . . he had more in mind than physical laws. What was real for Leibniz was not "extension," as Descartes had held, but "activity" proportional to degree of "sensitivity." The fundamental unit in his metaphysics was the monad, and the simplest monad was a kind of dimensionless elementary particle of energy; then there was a series of gradually more sensitive, and consequently more active, units including the human psyche and ultimately God. At certain of the higher levels the monad was something like a point of view —a substance capable of perception. Here Leibniz distinguished between animals and men. Animals have perceptions and, through memory, a "sort of consecutiveness" that as he describes it is very like the modern concept of a conditioned reflex. Men "act in a like manner as animals" most of the time, but also have "the knowledge of eternal and necessary truths" that "gives us reason and the sciences, thus raising us to a knowledge of ourselves and of God."

Spinoza's Correction

A passage from *The Secret Doctrine* is pertinent here:

> The student must now be shown the fundamental distinction between the system of Leibnitz and that of occult philosophy, on the question of the Monads, and this may be done with his *Monadology* before us. It may be correctly stated that were Leibnitz' and Spinoza's systems reconciled, the essence and Spirit of esoteric philosophy would be made to appear. From the shock of the two—as opposed to the Cartesian system—emerge the truths of the Archaic doctrine. Both opposed the metaphysics of Descartes. His idea of the contrast of two substances—Extension and Thought—radically differing from each other and mutually irreducible, was too arbitrary and too unphilosophical for them. Thus Leibnitz made of the two Cartesian substances two attributes of one universal unity, in which he saw God. Spinoza recognized but one universal indivisible substance and absolute ALL, like Parabrahman. Leibnitz, on the contrary perceived the existence of a plurality of substances. There was but ONE for Spinoza; for Leibnitz an infinitude of Beings, *from*, and *in*, the One. . . . If these two teachings were blended together and each corrected by the other,—and foremost of all the One Reality weeded of its personality—there would remain as sum total a true spirit of esoteric philosophy in them; the impersonal, attributeless, absolute divine essence which is *no* "Being," but the root of all being. (I, 628-29.)

A Depth Psychology

One further quotation from the article about Leibniz shows how far in advance of his times were his conceptions of psychology:

> Leibniz' psychology ideas were more fully developed in a long unpublished work he wrote to refute John Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding*. He respected Locke but he could not accept the English philosopher's doctrine that the mind amounts to a blank tablet on which experience writes. It was not that Leibniz believed in a concrete factual memory that was present in the brain at birth, but he did insist that experiences are registered in the mind in certain distinct patterns. Moreover, he did not agree with Locke and Descartes that conscious awareness makes up the whole world of mental activity. In effect, he proposed the existence of an unconscious. He observed that dreams often awaken previous thoughts; he even conceived of a theory of psychic trauma, noting that "when we are stunned by some blow, fall, symptom, or other accident, an infinite number of minute confused sensations take form within us."

No doubt the eminence of Leibniz in mathematical achievement made the occasion for this tribute in the *Scientific American,* but the time may come—before, perhaps, very long—when his philosophical metaphysics is valued as much or more. His doctrine of the monads alone can give modern scientific pantheisms a rationale for the moral realities of human life.

"None so Blind . . ."

A column in the *Hudson Dispatch* (April 21) answered the question "Can you hypnotize yourself?" in accordance with the consensus of medical opinion, admitting the possibility but emphasizing the inadvisability of self-hypnosis. "Unless and until we see what we are trying to do and the reasons that lie behind [bad habits]," it said, "tinkering with them by self-hypnosis may be dangerous." Yet in spite of this and similar warnings, there are still advocates of hypnosis who refuse to acknowledge its dangers. This answer, for example, brought an irate letter from a clergyman who, as pastoral counsellor, has been practicing hypnotism for years. All hypnosis, he asserted, is self-hypnosis—the hypnotist merely acting as a sort of "guide." After a blanket endorsement of therapeutic hypnotism, he said:

> I do not know of any person who has been harmed in any way through the use of hypnosis. In addition, I have never read of any documented proof or any convincing proof on which the

"hypnosis is dangerous" allegation could be in any way substantiated. Among the various phenomena utilized by man for his good, hypnosis is certainly the safest.

A Theosophist Replies

An answering letter (June 5) referred the clergyman to an article by Dr. Harold Rosen, titled "Hypnotism, the Cure that can be Dynamite" (New York *Tribune,* July 17, 1960), and listed some of the points made, including Dr. Rosen's statement that "for obvious reasons self-hypnosis can be potentially dangerous." (Cf. Lookout for September, 1960, p. 527.) The writer then gives the theosophic position:

> No Theosophist would ever allow himself to be hypnotized, whatever the intentions of the operator, nor would any student dream of imposing his will on another by this means. The advantages to be gained, if any, are few and dubious at best, while the dangers, known and unknown, are immeasurable.

Mr. Judge was even more emphatic in replying to a question about the use of hypnotism for intended good. He said:

> Replying in part to this question, one can only give a personal opinion, and mine is that hypnotism should be prohibited by law. No one but some very few high-minded and learned physicians should be allowed to practice it. I would as quickly prohibit the general mass of physicians from using it as the general mass of the public, for I regard it as a dangerous and injurious power. The great Charcot, who has popularized it, says he would have only competent physicians use it. In the present age of black selfishness I would vote for its total seclusion from use for the present. (THEOSOPHY 13: 150.)

Science in the World of Psi

Instances of careful experiment in various areas of psychic experience are obliging at least some scientists to recognize psychic phenomena as worthy of investigation. Some examples from an article in the September *Maclean's* will illustrate both old mechanistic attitudes and a growing awareness of the interrelatedness of the psychic principles of human beings:

> It began, David Thomson readily admits, as a very subjective search for something to explain his own inability to get along with people. It became a scientifically oriented experiment in which his psychiatrist, Dr. Jack Ward, became his partner. It has ended with the two men announcing that all humans may be surrounded by a force field—a sort of invisible aura—which, with the right electronic measuring equipment, can reveal a

man's state of mind.

Thomson, twenty-eight, writes technical instruction books for complex electronic equipment. When he left the U.S. Navy, which trained him as an electronics technician, he took his personality problems to Dr. Ward in Trenton, New Jersey. Thomson's basic problem was hypertension, or anxiety. He believed his tension was communicable and made others uncomfortable, just as a man's fear, or happiness, is communicable. Witness how panic spreads through a crowd.

Thomson reasoned that the greater the tension, or anxiety, the more acute the electro-chemical activity. He built a receiver of two capacitor plates, a preamplifier and a line recorder of the kind used in electrocardiographs. Dr. Ward examined twenty-five patients and diagnosed their anxiety levels as either high, medium or low. Thomson then measured their force fields. In each case his equipment's diagnosis was the same as the psychiatrist's.

"Bad Vibrations"?

Thomson also built a transmitter that "generates an electromagnetic field similar to that of a hyper-anxious man." The article continues:

He walked around with it in his pocket for a year—and says that it made people miserable. "In a restaurant a man would be eating his steak with obvious enjoyment until I turned on my transmitter. Then he'd become tense, and get up and leave his meal. It's subjective proof, this, so I'm reluctant to talk about it. But even my personality problems can't explain how I can walk into a crowded room, turn on the transmitter and clear the room, in fifteen minutes flat."

Interestingly enough, the psychiatrist refused to experiment with this device: "There's no point in making people worse," he said. So Thomson has produced about a dozen transmitters to duplicate the force field of a happy man.

Questionable Benefits

Thomson evaluates his work in this way:

"If I'm right, the machines could be set working near disturbed or anxious hospital patients, particularly children upset because they're away from home, and it would help them relax. You could use it in unruly crowds, too. If panic and violence is contagious, perhaps tranquility is as well."

Although one might imagine a use for such devices in some situations, this last statement shows the need to take into serious

account the septenary nature of man, in order to know more about what part of a human being is anxious, disturbed, unruly, or violent; and one can hardly avoid wondering about the value of such feelings, since this might indicate how to promote real healing for the whole man, instead of a superficial tranquility. It seems obvious that neither a happiness machine nor one radiating unpleasantness should be put into production before the inner causes of these conditions are better understood.

Are Our Dreams Really Ours?

The article also describes another sort of experiment: Dr. Montague Ullman, director of psychiatric services at Maimonides Hospital in Brooklyn, New York, and Dr. Stanley Krippner, a psychologist, have produced "significant statistical evidence" that it is possible for one person to influence the dreams of another. In one part of the Dream Laboratory at the hospital, individual subjects sleep, while in another part, a sender tries to transmit some content for them to dream about, usually a famous painting:

> Transmission of Gauguin's "The Moon and the Earth," which shows a naked, dusky Polynesian woman from the rear with her arms uplifted, prompted a girl secretary to dream about "Bathing suits . . . about getting out of the bath . . . hanging a bathing suit out to dry . . . about getting a tan."
>
> The most tuned-in dreamer thus far is Dr. William Erwin, a New York psychologist. He once received Van Gogh's "Boats on the Beach" as "being on a boardwalk or the beach . . . the sea coast . . . it makes me think of Van Gogh perhaps." Twice, Dr. Erwin was supposed to receive Salvador Dali's "The Sacrament of the Last Supper." The first night he reported dreams involving a table, the ocean, a glass of "very unusual wine," a magician and a group of people in which one was trying to do something destructive. The second-night's dreams involved the ocean, fishing boats and fishermen, the Christmas season, a doctor, a psychiatrist, the Mediterranean area, Biblical times—and food and a seafood restaurant.

Psychological Sea around Us

> Says Dr. Krippner, "At present, psychology and psychiatry view each of us as basically alone, alienated, and essentially isolated from others and our surroundings. Telepathy may teach us how wrong that is; that everyone and everything is an enmeshed, integral part of all life on earth."

Such experiments may be productive of two things: evidence of the reality of planes beyond the physical, and of flowing lines

of connection between all beings. In a climate of unemotional objectivity perhaps some of the pitfalls of psychic exploration can be avoided, and minds prepared for the rational consideration of Theosophical perspectives on such matters as dreams and psychic atmospheres.

Anthropological Mystery

The tiny mummy found near Casper, Wyoming, in 1932, has been shown by examination to be genuine, says the *National Enquirer* (Feb. 18). The "little fellow" was found in a small natural cave in the solid granite, a cave not more than four feet wide, four feet high, and possibly fifteen feet deep. The mummy was on a tiny ledge, legs crossed, sitting on its feet, arms folded in the lap. According to the curator of the Boston Museum Egyptian Department, the mummy looks like Egyptian mummies that have not been wrapped to prevent exposure to air; and the Anthropological Department of Harvard says there is no doubt of the genuineness of the mummy, for—

> An X-ray showed that here was a creature that had been a man, or man-like. It's tiny skull, the spine, the rib cage, the bones of the arms and legs were readily discernible. The little fellow had been about 14 inches tall in life. Mummified, he weighs about 12 ounces. The X-rays show a full set of teeth. Biologists who have examined it declare that the creature was about 65 years old at time of death.

Just as there were giants in olden days, so there were dwarfs; and, says H.P.B., they existed "relatively and *de facto* side by side."

Rare Psychic Ability

A Reuters dispatch from Moscow, Russia (April 7) tells of a woman who can stop a clock by willing it to do so, make apples jump off the table, and feed herself by "wishing" the food into her mouth. She says she inherited this power from her mother and has passed it on to her son. It takes her, says *Tass,* about half an hour to work herself into a state to use her ability.

Telekinesis, though less common than clairvoyance, telepathy, or precognition, is one of the powers latent in man; and, except when used by an adept who knows the psychic laws, depends on the peculiar nervous constitution of the medium.